

REMARKS

In the Office Action,¹ the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, 14-16, 18-21, 23-25, and 27² under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,103,663 to Inoue et al. ("*Inoue*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,917,912 to Ginter et al. ("*Ginter*") and U.S. Patent No. 7,110,984 to Spagna et al. ("*Spagna*").

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 6, 10, 15, 19-21, 23-25, and 27. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, 14-16, 18-21, 23-25, and 27 are currently pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-12, 14-16, 18-21, 23-25 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Inoue* in view of *Ginter* and *Spagna*.

Independent claim 1 recites an information processing apparatus of a client comprising:

a means for generating, after the client purchases the content, a restoration request file and storing the restoration request file on the information processing apparatus of the client, . . . wherein transmitting the restoring request includes uploading the restoration request file.

¹The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims.

Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

² Claim 4 was canceled by the response filed on April 4, 2008.

Inoue, *Ginter*, and *Spagna*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed means for generating.

Inoue discloses a single type of request, a license issue request. Col. 5, lines 55-62. In *Inoue*, a first device can put usage restrictions on a second terminal device or user such that licenses are issued to the second device to permit content usage under the restriction. Col. 2, lines 6-16.

Inoue does not disclose “generating, after the client purchases the content, a restoration request file and storing the restoration request file on the information processing apparatus of the client,” “wherein transmitting the restoring request includes uploading the restoration request file.”

Spagna does not cure the deficiencies of *Inoue*.

Spagna discloses a method for creating additional copies of a content. (Abstract). In *Spagna*, when a second copy of the identical content is requested, a hash value from the new transaction received during the request for an additional license is compared to a hash value in a local database. Col. 96, lines 21-35. If the hash values match, re-downloading the content is avoided. *Id.* at lines 36-39. If the hash values do not match, the requested content must be downloaded from a hosting site. *Id.* at lines 39-43.

Spagna does not teach or suggest, “generating, after the client purchases the content, a restoration request file and storing the restoration request file on the

information processing apparatus of the client,” “wherein transmitting the restoring request includes uploading the restoration request file,” as recited in claim 1.

Ginter does not cure the deficiencies of *Inoue* and *Spagna*.

Ginter discloses a restore routine to restore a secure database based on a backup. Col. 167, lines 35-38.

Ginter does not teach or suggest, “generating, after the client purchases the content, a restoration request file and storing the restoration request file on the information processing apparatus of the client,” “wherein transmitting the restoring request includes uploading the restoration request file,” as recited in claim 1.

Inoue, *Spagna*, and *Ginter*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest an information processing apparatus of a client comprising:

a means for generating, after the client purchases the content, a restoration request file and storing the restoration request file on the information processing apparatus of the client, . . . wherein transmitting the restoring request includes uploading the restoration request file.

Accordingly, *Inoue*, *Spagna*, and *Ginter*, alone or in combination, cannot render claim 1 obvious.

Independent claims 6, 10, 15, 19, and 24, while of different scope than claim 1, are allowable over *Inoue*, *Spagna*, and *Ginter* for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Applicants thereby respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 6, 10, 15, 19, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the timely allowance of the claims.

Dependent claims 2-3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, and 27 are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above in connection with independent claims 1, 6, 10, 15, 19 and 24. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2-3, 5, 7, 9, 11-12, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 23, 25, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and the timely allowance of these claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

If there is any fee due in connection with the filing of this Reply, please charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP

Dated: March 31, 2009

By: /Michael R. Kelly/
Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921